

report of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration. The report concerns a change in the name of the committee and I intend to move concurrence in this report later today. I think you will find at that time that there is unanimous consent for that action.

[*Editor's Note: For above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

Mr. Speaker: I must rise to advise the House of a reservation I have with regard to this report, having heard the content.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Not until I am finished. The report proposes a change of name for the committee, a recommendation procedurally itself innocuous, but one which nevertheless proposes a change in the Standing Orders. For this reason the recommendation may, in my view, be beyond the terms of reference of the committee. I doubt, therefore, that it would be in order to proceed on a motion for concurrence in the report of a committee which has gone beyond its terms of reference. I draw this matter to the attention of the House so that further consideration may be given to it.

I gather that the Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) would like to rise on a point of order to make comment prior to my making a ruling as to whether a motion for concurrence would be in order. Since he has indicated to me that he wishes to speak on a point of order to the possibility of such a ruling, I therefore reserve the ruling for the moment and hear the Member for Calgary West.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the action taken and the decision to report this matter to the House was taken unanimously in committee. We have searched the precedents, Mr. Speaker. In the preceding Parliament on November 27, 1979 there was a change in the name of one of our committees to its current name of Communications and Culture. The mechanism chosen at that time was Standing Order 43. There was unanimous consent for that action, so the two principles were there.

We now operate under provisional rules. I would first point out that the mechanism of Standing Order 43 is no longer available to us, but that one of the reasons we have provisional orders, and that they are provisional, is that we can begin to explore the possibilities and difficulties which a change in the rules might present. The elimination of Standing Order 43, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, presents a slight difficulty to the committee.

I will now proceed to the second precedent I would like to bring to your attention. On July 3, 1980 the special committee of this House presented its first report, asked for unanimous consent and moved concurrence in the decision to change its name to the Committee for Employment Opportunities for the 1980s. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the precedent of a committee report asking for a change of name existed on July 3, 1980, and was granted by the previous Speaker.

Committee Reports

May I further point out, Mr. Speaker, that another aspect of that decision at that time was the fact that the House granted unanimous consent for the action. The granting of unanimous consent is central to this issue because the House is indeed master of its own destiny. I would suggest to you that on this issue, which has been considered by the committee in the previous Parliament and again in this Parliament, we have found it difficult to find an efficient mechanism that would be clearly in accordance with all past precedents and all procedures that lie within our Standing Orders.

● (1510)

I suggest that this is the most acceptable and quickest way to resolve this issue. You may want to set a precedent today by allowing this kind of report and this type of action. However, if not, you could fall back on the principle of unanimous consent for the House to do what it deems advisable. May I suggest that such a ruling would not set a precedent that you would find difficult to live with. We should be allowed to move by unanimous consent, if that is the will of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member is making an interesting argument. First, he argues that if we had Standing Order 43 the Member would have proceeded by way of Standing Order 43. Without Standing Order 43, he argues therefore that this procedure would be in order. That is illogical.

His other argument is that the House can do whatever it wishes by unanimous consent. That may well be true; nevertheless, that does not make a motion to concur in a report which cannot be presented to the House in order. Unanimous consent may allow the House to change something it wishes to change, but it cannot make the report itself in order.

My dilemma is that the Member is proposing a motion to concur in a report which cannot, of itself, be in order. Therefore, I cannot simply admit an inadmissible motion by unanimous consent. That is how I understand the procedure.

Therefore, having heard the argument, I must rule that a motion to concur in the report would itself be inadmissible.

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have more than a passing interest in this matter because, as chairman of that standing committee—

Mr. Speaker: Is the Hon. Member rising on a separate point of order?

Mr. Crosby: Yes. I wanted to take the opportunity to explain that I have more than a passing interest in this because, as chairman of that standing committee in 1979, we made an attempt to change the name and it was believed it would be under Standing Order 43.

Is it permissible for a Member simply to ask for the consent of the House, in the absence of Standing Order 43, to make a motion and with that unanimous consent—

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Mr. Blenkarn: He is putting a motion.